SINGLE BENCH

P.R. No. 3673/06
Presented by Shri Satyendra Sahu 2
dated 18/7/06

BEFORE THE HON'BLE HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

W.P.(L) No. 3603 /2006

Surendra Surana,
S/o Shri Dev Raj Surana,
36/1, Byron Bazar,
Raipur.
Ex Partner of M/s Amar Chemicals,
6-A, Heavy Industrial Area,
Hathkhoj,
Bhilai Distt.Durg (C.G)

PETITIONER

Vs.

1. Union of India
Through Secretary
Sharm Shakti Bhawn
New Delhi

THAKUR VIJAY SINGH
Asst. Solicitor General of India
CHHATTISGARH HIGH COURT
High Court Campus, Bilaspur (C.G.)

2. Assistant. Provident Fund Commissioner
Office of the Employees Provident Fund Organization
Regional Office
Block D, Scheme No. 32, Indira Gandhi Commercial Complex
Raipur (Chhattisgarh)
Devendra Nagar, Pandri, Raipur (Chhattisgarh)

3. Regional Provident Fund Commissioner
Office of the Employees Provident Fund Organization
Regional Office
Block D, Scheme No. 32, Indira Gandhi Commercial Complex,
Devendra Nagar, Pandri, Raipur (Chhattisgarh

. . . **RESPONDENTS**

The Petitioner named above most humbly submits as under:

GOVT. OF CHHA... NOTARY ... LS CHAWLA NOTARY (ADVOCATE) RAIPUR (C.G.) INDIA Regd No. C.G. C1/21/30 10-03

1. PARTICULARS OF THE PETITIONER

As mentioned in the cause title

2. Particulars of Respondent:

As mentioned in the cause title

3. PARTICULARS OF THE ORDER AGAINST WHICH PETITION IS FILED :

(i) Notice/Order dated 7/7/2006 by which respondent No.3 has directed the petitioner to deposit Rs.4,58,287=00

XI-HC-78

उच्च न्यायालय, छत्तीसगढ़, बिलासपुर

(90)

मामला क्रमांक WP.No.3601 **सन् 200** 6

आदेश पत्रक (पूर्वानुबद्ध)

आदेश का दिनांक तथा आदेश क्रमांक	हस्ताक्षर सहित आदेश	कार्यालयीन मामलों में डिप्टी रजिस्ट्रार के अन्तिम आदेश
	21-7-2006:- Shri N.K. Vyas, counsel for the petitioner. Shri Pradeep Saxena, counsel for respondents No.2 and 3, on advance copy. Heard both the counsel. Learned counsel for the petitioner submitted that even though the petitioner has already preferred an appeal under Section 7 (I) of the Employees' Provident Funds and Miscellaneous Provisions Act, 1952 before the Tribunal at New Delhi but no presiding officer is posted in the Tribunal, therefore, per force, the petitioner has to file this writ petition. Having heard learned counsel for the parties and having regard to the fact that the Tribunal is without presiding officer, therefore, this writ petition has been filed, it is directed that on depositing 75% of the amount ascertained by the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner, execution and implementation of the order of the Regional Provident Fund Commissioner shall remain stayed, till the presiding officer is appointed and he starts functioning. With the direction aforesaid, the petition stands disposed of. Consequently, M.(W.)P. No.2797/2006 also stands disposed of. Parties are entitled for certified copy of this order. **Sd/-** **L.C.Bhadoo** **Judge**	

Barve

P.T.O.

26-7-06